



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/695,747 | 10/24/2000 | Roger D Melen | 4863(CFP1587US) | 1555 |

5514 7590 01/31/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, MARY DA ZHI WANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Office Action Summary | Applicant No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/695,747 | MELEN ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Mary Cheung | 3621 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 23-24, 27-30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252.

As to claim 1, Barker teaches a method to securely distribute document folders (document fragments) to recipients, said method comprising (abstract):

- a) Sending a small document (or a document fragment) to a network of interconnected computer (column 3 lines 26-29 and Fig. 1);
- b) Notifying each recipient by giving said recipient an indirect reference to each document fragment is taught by Barker as each recipient receives document fragments, and each document fragment has an indirect reference (column 3 lines 26-31);
- c) Selecting a destination location for each recipient to receive the document fragment intended for said recipient, using data provided by said recipient (column 2 line 60 – column 3 line 19 and Figs. 1-2);

d) Accumulating the sent document fragments at said destination location (column 3 lines 52-62 and Fig. 2).

As to claim 5, the indirect reference to each document folder comprises a folder code containing information needed to retrieve the document folder is taught by Barker as the indirect reference to each document fragment is need for retrieving the document (column 3 lines 26-29, 58-62).

As to claim 8, Barker teaches modifying (fragmenting) data for the best recipient use with regard to capabilities of a receiving device at said destination (abstract and column 3 lines 26-29).

As to claim 10, Barker teaches a recipient retrieving an electronic document fragment based upon providing information contained in said indirect reference (column 3 lines 26-29, 58-62).

As to claim 23, converting a sent electronic document folder into a page description language before sending a link to the electronic document folder to a recipient is taught by Barker as fragment the document to smaller sizes before delivering it a recipient (column 3 lines 26-29 and Fig. 1).

As to claim 27, Barker teaches at least one of device is from the group comprising a scanner, a facsimile machine, and a computer (Fig. 1).

As to claim 28, Barker teaches the receiving device is from the group comprising a web-enabled personal computer, a web-enabled printer, a web-enabled digital copier, and a web-enabled Internet appliance (Fig. 1).

Claims 24, 29-30 and 38 are rejected for the similar reasons as claims 1, 5, 8, 10 and 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 17, 21-22 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252.

As to claim 17, Barker does not explicitly teach the document folders are sent using virtual private network security. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the method document folders to Barker to be sent through virtual private network security because this commonly used network system would allow the user securely transferring information.

As to claims 21-22, Barker does not explicitly teach sending a notification via email or over a cellular phone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Barker to deliver a notification by these commonly known method (via email or over a cellular phone) so that the recipient can quickly and economically receive a notification.

Claims 25-26 are rejected for the similar reasons as claims 17 and 21-22.

6. Claims 2-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252 in view of Miller et al., U. S. Patent 6,151,696.

As to claims 2-4, Barker teaches a method to securely distribute document fragments to recipients as discussed above. Barker does not explicitly teach the data provided by each recipient comprising document reception address data and additional document reception data. However, Miller teaches the data provided by each recipient comprising document reception address data and additional document reception data (column 4 lines 12-16 and column 6 lines 30-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the data provided by each recipient in Barker to include document reception address data and additional document reception data so that the document fragment can be better distributed to the recipients.

As to claim 9, Barker teaches a method to securely distribute document fragments to recipients as discussed above. Barker does not specifically teach sending acknowledgment to a sender. However, Miller teaches this matter (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to allow the method of Barker to send acknowledgment to a sender because it would allow the sender to know the status of the transmitted documents so that the documents would be transmitted more efficiently.

7. Claims 6-7, 11-16 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252 in view of Kovnat et al., U. S. Patent 5,619,649.

As to claim 6, Barker teaches folder code as discussed above. Barker does not specifically teach the folder code is a privacy code. The privacy code is taught by Kovnat as a pin number. Kovnat teaches each information (job) is assigned to a pin number, and user needs to the pin number to retrieve the information (Figs. 16-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the folder code (or the indirect reference) of Barker to be a pin number so that only the authorized user can retrieve the information.

As to claim 7, Barker teaches folder code as discussed above. Barker does not specifically teach the folder code is a mediocard data, said media card data delivered to each recipient prior to said recipient's accessing an electronic document folder. Kovnat teaches each information (job) is assigned to a pin number, and user needs to the pin number in order to access the information (Figs. 16-17). Kovnat does not specifically teach the pin number is mediocard data; however, it well known in the art the pin number is can be issue on paper, on a card, or through email, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the pin number to be issue on a mediocard so that the recipient can carry around for remotely accessing the information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the folder code (or the indirect reference) of Barker to be a media data so that only the authorized user can retrieve the information.

As to claims 11-14, Barker does not specifically teach authentication step.

However, Kovnat teaches authentication step (Figs. 16-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Barker to include the authenticate step for better securing the information.

As to claim 15, Barker does not specifically teach at least one document within a sent document folder has printable representation. However, Kovnat teaches this matter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Barker to include a printable document so that some of information can be printed for better viewing.

As to claim 16, Barker teaches does not explicitly teach at least one document folder comprises exactly one document. However, this matter is taught by Kovnat as each transmitted packet has a limited size (column 7 lines 33-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Barker to include at least one document folder comprises exactly one document so that some of the documents do not need fragmentation if the size of the document is small.

Claim 37 is rejected for the similar reasons as claims 11-14.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252 in view of Walker et al., U. S. Patent 5,862,223.

As to claim 18, Barker does not specifically teach charging a recipient upon the recipient's taking delivery of an electronic document folder when the electronic document folder has been sent C. O. D. However, this matter is taught by Walker as a C. O. D. system that requires recipient to pay prior to delivery (column 22 lines 12-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Barker to include the C. O. D. system so that the sender can be surely paid.

9. Claims 19-20 and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al., U. S. Patent 6,233,252 in view of Griswold, U. S. Patent 5,940,504.

As to claims 19-20, Barker does not specifically teach charging a recipient when the document folder has been stored on the network beyond an agree-upon period of time. Griswold teaches the license is expired if the present date is greater than license termination date (Fig. 7). Griswold does not specifically state charging the user if the product is used beyond the license termination date. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Griswold to charge the user if the product is used beyond the license termination date so that the licensing owner can be better compensated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the method of Barker to include charging recipient if the document if used beyond an agreed period of time so that the sender can be better compensated.

As to claim 34, the method of Barker modified by Griswold does not specifically teach sending C. O. D. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

allow the modified method to include sending C. O. D. so that the sender can be surely paid.

Claims 31-33 and 35-36 are rejected for the similar reasons as claims 19-20.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

DeRose et al. (U. S. Patent 6,167,409) discloses documents sent over the network by a server is provided by a mechanism which combines context information with a document, or document fragment, to be sent.

Gosling (EP 0 770 965 A1) discloses a client receives a compound document, and the client determines whether it has access to all of the documents referenced in the compound document and, if not, requests the documents to which it does not have local access.

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Cheung whose telephone number is (703)-305-0084. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceedings is assigned are as follows:

(703) 305-7687 (Official Communications; including After Final Communications labeled "BOX AF")

(703) 746-5619 (Draft Communications)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Mary Cheung
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621
January 23, 2003

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600